

International Education: Security Council of the United Nations with Emphasis on the People's Republic of China

This lesson is designed as a classroom study of the Security Council of the United Nations, of the changing role of world states from 1945 to the 21st century, and the foreign policy of the United States in regards to the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China. This lesson is will take five one-hour class periods to complete and about two hours of student homework.



I. Content:

I want my students to understand (or be able to):

- A. The Security Council of the United Nations: it's structure, roles and powers.
- B. The states that make up the current Security Council and compare/contrast them economically, socially, politically, religiously and geographically.
- C. The changing role of the world since World War II as reflected in the structure of the United Nations Security Council.
- D. The history of People's Republic of China and the Republic of China (Taiwan) from 1945 to present as related to membership in the United Nations.
- E. The future role of the U.S. in the United Nations and UN Security Council.
- F. The future role of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China in the United Nations and in the UN Security Council.

II. Prerequisites:

In order to fully appreciate this lesson, the student must know (or be experienced in):

- A. The basic history of the United States and shift in US foreign policy after World War II from isolationism to internationalism. This should include reviewing the League of Nations, the Allied and Axis Powers, and the aftermath of World War II that resulted in the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China.
- B. The students should know the basic structure of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, International Court of Justice, Secretariat, and other specialized agencies.
- C. Research skills, including work in The World Almanac and the Internet.

Subject: American Government

Grade Level: 12

Instructional Block / Theme: U.S. Foreign policy and the United Nations

International Education: Security Council of the United Nations with Emphasis on the People's Republic of China

III. Instructional Objective(s):

The student will:

- A. Describe the role of the Security Council, its basic structure, and the voting power including the difference between the permanent and non-permanent members.
- B. List demographics of the U.S. and other members of the Security Council, as well as Taiwan. Other states seeking Security Council membership also can be researched.
- C. Compare and contrast the current members of the Security Council, including Taiwan using the economic, social, religious, historical, political and geographic demographics.
- D. Discuss the shift in U.N. membership in 1971 from Taiwan to the P. R. of China.
- E. Role-play the present Security Council, discussing and voting on suggested reforms in the Security Council and on the admission of the Republic of China to U.N. membership.
- F. Type an essay reacting to the membership, structure and power of the United Nations and of the Security Council, as well as the dilemma of future reforms.

IV. Materials and Equipment

Teacher: Student Templates (See appendix)

- #1 United Nations Security Council
 - #2 United Nations Budget and Dues
 - #3 Questions for Demographics Comparison
 - #4 Readings on the Reform of the Security Council
 - #5 Readings on the Republic of China
- Teacher Templates (See appendix)
- #1 Sample Note card
 - #2 Suggested proposals for Security Council Reform
 - #3 Essay/Response
- The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2004

Internet Access: www.un.org

5"X8" note cards

Colored pencils, crayons, scissors, glue, other art supplies

Student: Computer and Internet Access

V. Instructional Procedure:

International Education: Security Council of the United Nations with Emphasis on the People's Republic of China

Day 1

- A. Begin each class period with a quote and a short discussion. Suggested quotes are given below. Show pictures of the United Nations from the United Nations website: www.un.org.

Sample UN quotes:

“The aim of the United Nations is to substitute peaceful negotiations for war.”

Harry S Truman
33rd U.S. President

“Our strength and hope for peace is in the U.N. I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world.”

John F. Kennedy
34th U.S. President

“When we pull together from across the world, and work together to solve a problem, we almost always can do it.”

Kofi Annan
UN Secretary General 1997-present

“The law should guarantee human rights. It should allow everyone to respect others and to be respected.”

Article 29 Universal
Declarations
of Human Rights

- B. Read the article on UN Security Council (See appendix Student template #1) and the article on the UN Budget and Membership dues (see appendix Student template #2). Other sources of information may be used.
- C. Using appendix Teacher template # 1, assign each student the role of the other Security Council members include the Republic of China. Other “potential” Security Council members may be assigned depending on the size of the class and the objective of the teacher in discussing reforms.

If they are not current members of the present Security Council, suggested states to include are Japan, Germany, Mexico, Brazil, India, and South Africa. Depending on the size of your class and for added

International Education: Security Council of the United Nations with Emphasis on the People's Republic of China

diversity, other states to research might include Sudan, Kenya, Ethiopia, San Marino, Israel, Iran, or others.

Day 2

- A. On the lined side of the 5" x 8" note-card, the teacher directs the students to list the desired information. Next, the teacher models the corresponding statistics for the United States. See appendix for Teacher template # 1 for an example.
- B. Students will look up these demographics for their assigned state using The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2004 and the United Nations website. The number of each line corresponds with a fact. This is important to help facilitate the comparison activity.
- C. The student then design and decorate the front side of the 5"x8" note-card. Criteria for the design on the card must include the name of their assigned state in large letters (to be read across the room) and also be a creative representative of that country. Suggested designs often include the flag, major attractions, or cultural symbols. Student creativity is encouraged.

Day 3

- A. With the teacher leading the activity and the students playing the part of their assigned Security Council member country, have the students line up in a giant "U" shape in the front of the classroom. Each student hold up their card so all can see the country's name as the various fact sets are shared. For example, the students line up by population starting with China down to the smallest population. With the next topic of population density, the students will then re-arrange themselves from highest to lowest density, etc. The teacher or students can comment on the repositioning of the states. The teacher should prompt discussions on the diversity of the states economically, politically, geographically, and religiously. The last comparison will pit the permanent Security Council members with veto power against the non-permanent Security Council members without veto power. Taiwan should be interchanged in each of the comparisons. If other world states are included in this comparison exercise, have them remain seated at their desks and interject verbally or physically in the line-up, but only temporarily.

Day 4

- B. The students return to their seats and answer questions from the comparative demographic activity, using Student Template #3 as a

International Education: Security Council of the United Nations with Emphasis on the People's Republic of China

guide. The student's written responses and the decorated fact card can be collected, graded and discussed.

- C. The teacher distributes the readings on Security Council using the readings from the appendix using Student template #4. Other articles concerning this topic can be obtained from the United Nations websites or periodicals.
- D. The teacher distributes the readings on the admittance of the Republic of China from the appendix using Student template # 5. Other articles concerning this topic can be obtained from the United Nations websites or periodicals.

Day 5

- A. Reconfigure the classroom desks to emulate the Security Council (see Teacher Template #2). Review the role of Security Council members since the end of World War II, with focus on the fairness and equity of the permanent veto members in today's world. The students imitate the Security Council by role-playing their assigned countries in order to vote on suggested reforms. See Teacher Template # 2 for suggested reform plans. The students may also formulate and present their own reforms plans to the model Security Council. In addition, have the Council members discuss and vote on the admission of the Republic of China to the United Nations General Assembly.
- B. Closure: Assign the student essay. See appendix Teacher Template # 3.

VI. Assessment / Evaluation:

- A. The student state card will be graded on quality, content and creativity.
- B. The Comparison card questions should be graded on quality of reactions as well as specific demographics supporting these responses.
- C. The students may also be graded on their discussion, participation, and role-playing of their country in the comparison activity and/or on their reform votes.
- D. The student will type a two page paper regarding the Security Council, its structure and powers, including the veto power. Suggested reforms and the admission of the Republic of China in the United Nations should be incorporated. Viewpoints of assigned country may be compared and contrasted with the view of the United States government. The essay will be graded for content and understanding of the issues.

VII. Idaho Achievement Standards:

International Education: Security Council of the United Nations with Emphasis on the People's Republic of China

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 9-12.G.5.1.3 | Describe the characteristics of United States foreign policy and how it has been made and implemented over time. |
| 9-12.G.5.1.4 | Identify and evaluate the role of the United States in international organizations and agreements, such as United Nations, NAFTA, and the International Red Cross. |

VIII. Follow Up or Extension Activities:

- A. Use Lesson # 7 “Government without the Consent of the Governed: Hungary, 1956” from Comparative Lessons for Democracy, a product of CIVITAS: An International Civic Education Exchange Program.
 - 1. This Reader’s Theatre is constructed with excerpts from “A Student’s Diary: Budapest”, Oct 16-Nov. 1, 1956 by Laszlo Beke and “The Hungarian Revolution” by Melvin Lasky 1957.
 - 2. The lesson illustrates the refusal of the UN Security Council to intervene in the 1957 Hungarian Revolt by students. This inaction was due to a threaten veto by the Soviet Union. Students enjoy the dramatic role-playing theatre of this incident.
 - 3. Critical thinking comparisons may be drawn concerning the objective of People’s Republic of China goal to absorb Taiwan through the use of its permanent veto power..
- B. Show the movie “The Last Emperor”.

Appendix A

Student Template # 1

Membership and Presidency of the Security Council in 2004*

*Up-dated list can be obtained at www.un.org/Docs/unsc_members.html

i.e. Argentina, Denmark, Greece, Japan, and Tanzania were elected to serve 31 Dec. 2006

January	Chile	31 Dec. 2004
February	China	Permanent Member
March	France	Permanent Member
April	Germany	31 Dec. 2004
May	Pakistan	31 Dec. 2004
June	Philippines	31 Dec. 2005
July	Romania	31 Dec. 2005
August	Russian Federation	Permanent Member
September	Spain	31 Dec. 2004
October	United Kingdom	Permanent Member
November	United States	Permanent Member
December	Algeria	31 December 2005
	Angola	31 December 2004
	Benin	31 December 2005
	Brazil	31 December 2005

The Council has 15 members, five permanent members and 10 non-permanent, selected by the General Assembly for two-year terms. Each country member has one vote. Decisions on substantive matters are made by an affirmative vote of at least nine of the 15 members, including the concurring votes of all five permanent members. This rule of “great Power unanimity” is often referred to as the “veto” power. The five permanent powers are the People’s Republic of China, France, Russia, Britain and the United States. Of the 10 non-permanent members, five must be from Africa & Asia, two from Latin

America, and two from Western Europe and other nations. Non-permanent members are eligible for re-election. The council also includes a presidency, which is occupied in month-long terms taken in turn by council members in English alphabetical order. The Council membership was last expanded from 11 to 15 members in 1963.

On procedural matters, decisions of the Security Council require the supporting votes of nine council members. On all other matters, a vote of nine must include concurring votes of all permanent members. A veto by any permanent member defeats the vote. An abstention by a permanent member is not considered a veto. Any member of the Security Council that is party to a dispute before the council must abstain from voting on that issue. The veto has been exercised 253 times since the U.N. was founded in 1945.

Noteworthy nay votes include:

In 1956, when Egypt nationalizes the Suez Canal, Israel, France and Britain attack. London and Paris reject the Council's cease-fire resolution. The U.S. then takes the resolution to the General Assembly, which demands a cease-fire. Britain and France withdraw.

The Security Council passes a resolution condemning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. The U.S.S.R. casts a "nyet" vote, one of over 121 vetoes cast by the Soviet Union. The last Soviet troops are not withdrawn from Afghanistan until 1989.

In 1996, U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros –Ghali from Egypt is nominated for a second term. The U.S. vetoes the nomination in a closed session calling Boutros-Ghali's reform efforts "halfhearted". Kofi Annan takes over the top U.N. job.

The Guatemalan Civil War is ending in 1997. The U.N. wants to send in peacekeepers. Angry with Guatemalans for its warm ties to rival Taiwan, China votes down the idea. Ten days later, China rescinds its veto; in return, Guatemala stops pressing the U.N. for membership for Taiwan.

In March 2001, violence in the Middle East escalates, leading to deaths among Israeli and Palestinian civilians. The U.S. rejects a resolution to send U.N. observers to the Palestinian territories, saying it was an unbalanced approach. The observers stay home.

The Security Council is charged with maintaining international peace and security. Under the Charter, all members agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. While other organs of the United Nations make recommendations to Governments, the Council alone has the power to take decisions that Member States are obligated under the Charter to carry out. Under the Charter, the functions and powers of the Security Council are:

- To maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations;
- To investigate any dispute or situation which might lead to international friction;
- To recommend methods of adjusting such disputes or the terms of settlement;
- To formulate plans for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments;
- To determine the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression and to recommend what action should be taken;
- To call on Members to apply economic sanctions and other measures not involving the use of force to prevent or stop aggression;
- To take military action against an aggressor;
- **To recommend the admission of new Members;**

- To exercise the trusteeship functions of the United Nations in “strategic areas”
- To recommend to the Court of Justice and with the Assembly to elect the Judges of the International Court of Justice.

Student Template # 2

United Nations Budget and Dues

The regular budget of the U.N. is \$1.3 billion per year. It pays for U.N. activities, staff and basic infrastructure, but not peacekeeping operations, which have a separate budget. The U.N. system spends \$12 billion a year including peacekeeping operations, programs, and specialized agencies like the World Food Program, the U.N. Children's Fund and Population Fund. States of the U.N. are obligated by the Charter, an international treaty, to pay a portion of the budget calculated on its share of the world economy. Just over half of this amount comes from voluntary contributions of the member states and the remainder is received from mandatory assessments on those states. The primary criterion is based on estimates of their gross national product (GNP) and a number of adjustments, including external debt and low per capita incomes. The minimum of .001 percent to a maximum of 22 percent is determined by the General Assembly. In 2002, the 43 countries contributing at the minimum rate were assessed \$11,104 each. The largest contributor, the United States was assessed 22% or \$283, 076, 321. The European Union together contributes some 35% of the budget.

To put the U.N. expenditures (\$1.3 billion for the U.N. alone and \$12 billion for the entire system) in perspective, compare their expenditure's to other governments and systems:

- The administrative budget of the European Community is \$4.5 billion.
- Two U.S. States, Wyoming and South Dakota have a budget of more than \$2 billion
- The annual budget for the city of Zurich is \$3.1 billion.
- The University of Minnesota has a budget of \$1.9 billion.
- The budget of the New York City Board of Educations, \$12.4 billion exceeds that of the entire U.N. system.
- World military expenditures, some \$800 billion a year, would pay for the entire U.N. system for more than 65 years.

The budget itself has declined significantly over the past ten years allowing for inflation and currency fluctuations despite constant demands for new programs and activities. Since 1994, the U.N. Oversight Office has helped save or recover some \$87 million.

Some states have withheld payments due to budgetary technicalities or poverty, as a way to exert pressure on the U.N. or to make a political point. The total of unpaid assessed contributions is \$2.1 billion, with the United States owing \$690 million. Of the U.N.'s 191 member states, 54 (or some 29%) have not paid their regular budget dues. No state or private company could function under such conditions. Under the UN Charter, a member state can be deprived of its vote in the General Assembly if its arrears equal or exceed the amount of the contributions due from it for the previous two years. Nonetheless, the achievements, which benefit people everywhere, are often taken for granted:

- U.N. agencies have improved the health of millions by fighting diseases, providing safe drinking water, and protecting consumers' health as evidenced by longevity increases the world over.
- The World Food Program provides about 1/3 of the world' food aid each year.
- The U.N. has strengthened democracy by assisting elections in over 80 countries.
- Smallpox was eradicated from the world through the World Health Organization and aims to eradicate polio by 2005.
- The U.N. has promoted independence of more than 80 nations.
- U.N. relief agencies provided aid and protection to 25.7 million refugees worldwide.
- The World Bank and the U.N. Development Program provides \$30 billion assistance, including victims of war and natural disasters.
- The work of the U.N. benefits business all over the world by promoting exports, removing trade barriers, promoting uniform trade laws and protecting copyrights.

Student Templates #3

Using your Security Council Members cards, write answers to the following questions in complete sentences.



1. Explain why you think I had you make the “state” card of the members of the Security Council.
2. Explain why you think I had you do the state comparison activity (line-up) of the Security Council members.
3. Explain 2-3 of the most interesting facts you learned about your assigned state by completing the fact card. Be specific.
4. What were the most 2-3 most surprising or interesting facts that you learned about other members of the Security Council?
5. Using the fact card, describe 3 ways your assigned state is like the United States and 3 ways it is unlike the US. * You may use any combination of similarities/dissimilarities as long as you respond to 6 ideas. Be specific with demographics for each answer.
6. Explain any inequities in the balance/representation/power of the present Security Council members (i.e. economical, political, religious, regional, etc.) that you perceived.

Student Template # 4

Readings on the Reform of the Security Council

BUSINESS AS USUAL AT THE U.N.

For the United Nations, relevance may be almost as perilous as irrelevance. In the span of a year, the Bush administration went from taunting the world body to begging for its help. A beefed-up U.N. team will soon arrive in Baghdad to advise the Iraqi government on reconstruction, social services, and human rights and directly assist with elections. At the same time, U.N. peacekeeping missions are sprouting or expanding in Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, and Ivory Coast. Indeed, by the end of 2004, more blue helmets will likely be in action than at any time in history.

Although some U.N. backers revel in the growing global reliance on the world body, now is no time to get smug. These weighty responsibilities are landing on the shoulders of an organization that national governments have deliberately kept weak. The United Nations' 60-year-old machinery has never seemed so ill-equipped for its work, and its credibility has plummeted. As the major powers fight terrorism and dwell on homeland security, they will hand the United Nations essential but thankless tasks they might once have tackled themselves (or just ignored). Without major changes, the United Nations may well buckle under the growing strain.

The idea that the United Nations can stumble along in its atrophied condition has powerful appeal in capitals around the world--and even in some offices at U.N. headquarters. But believing that the status quo will suffice is dangerous.

Regrettably, most of those who could change the organization have an interest in resisting reform. None of the permanent Security Council members wants to give up its veto; smaller powers delight in their General Assembly votes, which count as much as those of the major powers; repressive regimes cherish participation in United Nations' human rights bodies, where they can scuttle embarrassing resolutions; and the Western powers whose troops and treasure are needed to strengthen U.N. peacekeeping have other priorities. Even within the U.N. bureaucracy, many veterans shy away from dramatic reform--it has taken them decades to become masters of the old procedures, and change is risky. And while U.N. officials, including the secretary-general, are quick (and correct) to blame the member states for the constraints they face, they too rarely find the courage to spotlight those specific states whose obstinacy, stinginess, and abuses undermine the principles behind the U.N. Charter.

Much U.N.-bashing is, of course, unfair. The United Nations is in many respects just a building. It is a place for states to butt heads or to negotiate as their national interests dictate. And, on the operational side, the organization performs many indispensable tasks--feeding, sheltering, and immunizing millions, and even disarming the odd Iraqi dictator. But the organization's reputation rises and falls these days based on the performance and perceived legitimacy of three of its most visible components--the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights, and the peacekeepers in the field. Each is in dire need of reform or rescue.

Permanent membership on the Security Council--granted to the Second World War victors (plus France)--is woefully anachronistic. Britain and France can't fairly claim two fifths of the world's legal authority. The permanent five members once spoke for close to 40 percent of

the world's population. They now account for 29 percent. The world's largest democracy (India) is excluded; so are regional powerhouses such as Nigeria and Brazil, not to mention the entire Islamic world. It is the permanent members who decide when atrocities warrant humanitarian intervention, but this decision is made by two of the planet's worst human rights abusers (Russia and China) and one country (the United States) that exempts itself from most international human rights treaties. While still coveted in some cases, the council imprimatur is fast losing its sheen.

The Commission on Human Rights, the 53-state forum based in Geneva, has become a politicized farce. Because the commission takes all comers (seats are allocated on a regional basis), some of the world's most vicious regimes are members. Libya chaired the 2003 commission, and this year's commission extended membership to Sudan, which is busy ethnically cleansing hundreds of thousands of Africans in Darfur. Until membership comes with responsibilities, the commission will shelter too many human rights abusers and condemn too few.

When the states on the Security Council tell the secretary-general to put boots on the ground, his peacekeepers often face impossible assignments. They march into some of the world's most treacherous conflict zones, but only those where major Western economic and security interests are not at stake. Not coincidentally, the peacekeepers invariably lack the wherewithal to actually keep peace. In the 1990s, peacekeepers who were chained to Serbian lampposts became poster boys for the international community's impotence, as Western powers dispatched lightly armed troops to Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia without the mandate or means to stop genocide. To accommodate the unexpected surge in demand for peacekeeping in the last year, Secretary-General Kofi Annan (who likes to joke that "S.G." stands for "scapegoat") has appealed for more troops, intelligence resources, and logistical support--and the ability to call upon reinforcements if needed.

Funding for peacekeeping missions has increased somewhat, but another \$1 billion is needed. Even more important, the United Nations must be able to recruit soldiers from the major powers, which have coughed up only a few hundred troops in recent years. The countries that do contribute significant forces--including Pakistan, Bangladesh, Uruguay, and Nigeria--are often lured by the cash and military hardware they receive just for turning up. No wonder command and control of these forces often melts down. If the major powers continue to deploy peacekeepers on the cheap, the Security Council will again set up the United Nations for failure--and endanger the millions of desperate civilians who have no choice but to rely on the baby blue flag.

To a large extent, the United States and other member states get the United Nations they want and deserve. But proponents of U.N. reform should view the quagmire in Iraq as a moment of opportunity. Rather than regarding the United Nations' new centrality as evidence of success, the secretary-general must talk some sense into the member states, who stubbornly persist in believing that a hobbled United Nations can meet the 21st century's deadly transnational challenges.

Dag Hammarskjöld, the United Nations' second secretary-general, liked to say that the United Nations was not created to take humanity to heaven but to save it from hell. Even escaping hell requires an international organization that is up to the job.

By Samantha Power, lecturer in public **policy** at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government and author of "A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), which won the 2003 Pulitzer Prize.

Copyright of **Foreign Policy** is the property of Foreign Policy and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual use.

Source: Foreign Policy, Sep2004 Issue 144, p38, 2p

Item: 14276510

TIME FOR RADICAL *REFORM* AT THE *U.N.*?

In early September, *U.N.* Secretary-General Kofi Annan said of the world body over which he presides: "I have an uneasy feeling the system is not working as it should."

If the speaker had been anyone but Annan, his words might have been taken for an ironic understatement, a commentary on the state in which the United Nations finds itself in 2003. It's been left at the altar on Iraq, sometimes dismissed as irrelevant by the world's lone superpower, and riven by discord on human rights, global warming, fair trade, nuclear nonproliferation, and, of course, the war on terrorism.

But Annan, typically, was not trying to be funny. The General Assembly, Security Council, and other *U.N.* bodies are in danger of losing their credibility, he said, and they need help -- or overhaul. "If they are to regain their authority, they may need radical *reform*," he said.

Two weeks later, Annan turned up the heat. "Excellencies," he told the General Assembly at its opening session on September 23, "we have come to a fork in the road. This may be a moment no less decisive than 1945 itself, when the United Nations was founded." The secretary-general then announced he would be appointing a blue-ribbon panel to report back to him within a year on ways to *reform* the world body.

He said the institution needs to figure out how to deal with threats posed by terrorists and weapons of mass destruction. It needs to make the Secretariat stronger and the General Assembly more effective. In particular, he said, the Security Council -- *reform* of which has been stymied by fighting over a post-Cold War recalibration -- needs urgent attention. And the secretary-general said in a rare scolding: "I respectfully suggest to you, excellencies, that in the eyes of your peoples, the difficulty of reaching agreement does not excuse your failure to do so."

Despite Annan's passion and the obvious need to retool the United Nations into a body capable of dealing with threats undreamed of in 1945 -- terrorism, HIV/AIDS, and staggering economic inequality, to name a few -- efforts to remold it are likely to meet stiff resistance. Change at the United Nations, which now has 191 members, intimates a change in world order and priorities, and a shift in the status quo is as repellent to states that hold power as it is appealing to states that do not.

Reforming the United Nations is not a new idea, nor is it one greeted with much enthusiasm. In 1945, the institution's founders, fearing the fledgling body had been weakened in negotiations, proposed that a charter review conference be held after the organization's first 10 years. By 1955, though, Cold War hostilities made that impossible. The first attempt at *U.N. reform* was a bust.



KOFI ANNAN: "This may be a moment no less decisive than 1945 itself, when the United Nations was founded."

Today, the prognosis is not much better, especially where the Security Council is concerned. Two ideas have been knocking around since 1992, when a working group on council **reform** was established: to enlarge the council into a more widely representative body, and to weaken the veto of its five permanent members -- China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The path to either of those changes, experts agree, is difficult and fraught with peril.

"As someone who has represented the United States in the Security Council, it seems to me that the larger the council gets, the more ineffective and unwieldy it will become, and some already complain that it's not effective now," says Thomas Pickering, who served as the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations from 1989 to 1992. "I think, if anything, there's [less] appetite for that than there was several years ago," when the United States under President Clinton supported permanent seats for Germany and Japan and was prepared to accept a Security Council with up to 20 members. It currently has 15 members, including the five permanents. (Last week, the General Assembly, in accordance with normal **U.N.** procedure, approved five countries -- Algeria, Benin, Brazil, the Philippines, and Romania -- for new two-year terms on the Security Council, to succeed outgoing nonpermanent members Bulgaria, Cameroon, Guinea, Mexico, and Syria on January 1, 2004.)

David Malone, former Canadian ambassador to the world body, concurs with Pickering. Now the president of the International Peace Academy, a conflict-resolution think tank in New York City, Malone doubts that the council's most powerful members would cooperate with an expansion plan.

"Russia and China are both publicly open but privately hostile to a change in composition," he says. "Their attitude is: If it ain't broke, why fix it? They hear that in an enlarged council, their own influence and power will be diluted, and that doesn't suit them. One suspects that similar considerations are

also in the mind of the United States."

As for the British and the French, Malone says, they "are only keen to anchor their own existing permanent seats." An Italian proposal for a single European Union seat in keeping with the E.U.'s drive toward a single-voice foreign policy has heightened the sense of worry in London and Paris on the subject.

Perhaps the largest obstacle to change is that these five, as permanent, veto-wielding members of the Security Council, have the power to nix any proposed change in council membership, as well as, ironically, modification of the veto itself.

Yet calls for change persist. The Security Council, explains Don Kraus, executive director of the Washington-based Campaign for **U.N. Reform**, originally mirrored the post-World War II power structure. The five victors held permanent seats and a right of veto that expressed in diplomatic terms their supposed ability to "veto" by military means each other's actions. Six nonpermanent seats, each held for two years upon election by region, gave the rest of the world a say. (In 1963, four more nonpermanent seats were added for Asia and Africa, bringing the total of nonpermanent seats to 10.)

Now that the Cold War bipolarity that kept the world stable, if tense, has dissolved, and global power has shifted, Kraus says, many nations want a Security Council that reflects the modern world. Japan and Germany ask why they, as two of the world's three economic titans, should not have permanent seats on the council. Meanwhile, cries have gone up from the global South that the council is already dominated by the northern industrialized nations. India, a nuclear power and the world's largest democracy, wants an assured place at the table, although Pakistan would resist it. Brazil, too, covets a seat -- over the strenuous objections of regional rivals Mexico and Argentina. In Africa, Egypt, Nigeria, and South Africa all consider themselves worthy candidates for permanent membership. "For many of these countries, it's not making sense," says Kraus. "The institution is locked in time."

Pickering, however, questions whether enlarging the Security Council is a good idea in the first place. "The Security Council has to be representative, but it also has to reflect the ability to get the most difficult questions of peace and security worked on under its aegis," he says. And if the council did expand, he adds, it would be "asked to make a kind of impossible stretch, a kind of four-way rubber band, in being both representative and efficient, and the two don't necessarily go hand in hand."

That is why, says **U.N.** expert Jeff Laurenti, the problem requires creative thinking. "I don't think you break the logjam by multiplying the number of permanent seats," says Laurenti. "But I do think we have to think differently about the Security Council than treating it as an exclusive country club for a short list of powers whose names get carved in granite."

Laurenti suggests a "requalification" process for the permanent seats whereby every 10 years, for example, states reassess the global power structure and award the prime contenders quasi-permanent status. "This is the kind of thing where you agree on it in 2005 and implement it in 2030, so that the pain is delayed, and so that the political figures who have done it will be in nursing homes or further on their way to their great reward when it goes into effect," Laurenti adds.

The veto may be an even more intractable problem. Its power to paralyze the council has prompted reformers to suggest several alternatives, including requiring that two of its members vote "no" for a veto to take effect; allowing its use only when a nation's sovereignty is threatened; or scrapping it altogether.



*THORNY PROBLEM: Experts say it may be difficult, even impossible, to **reform** the **U.N.** Security Council, because the five permanent members have the power to veto any changes--even alternations to the veto power itself.*

"The permanent members dislike intensely any discussion or any thought about whether the veto should be limited or circumscribed," Pickering says. "The problem is, if the veto issue were opened up in terms of charter **reform**, it would take forever because change of the veto is subject to the veto of someone who might lose it." When all is said and done, he says, "I'm not sure [**reforms**] will solve much, and even if they do, is the council, in its capability, going to improve by making that happen?"

As herculean a task as Security Council **reform** may be, perhaps the most daunting challenge for Annan's blue-ribbon panel lies in equipping the United Nations with the mechanisms necessary to tackle two competing sets of threats -- the "hard threats" of terrorism and unconventional weapons on the one hand, and the "soft threats" of poverty and disease on the other.

Some countries view terrorism, international criminal networks, and weapons of mass destruction as the principal threats to peace, Annan told a group of senior **U.N.** Development Program directors in New York City on October 7. But many other countries would surely identify civil strife, poverty, HIV/AIDS, and human-rights abuses as more-urgent dangers, he said -- and the two sets of threats feed each other.

"Our central challenge is to ensure we have the rules, instruments, and institutions to deal with all these threats and issues," he said. "After all, they are linked. A world not advancing toward the Millennium Development Goals [of halving extreme global poverty by 2015] will not be at peace. And a world awash in violence will have little chance of advancing the goals."

To follow Annan's logic, one need only consider the widely held view that poverty-stricken, oppressive states are the "breeding grounds" for terrorism, then contemplate the prospect of African nations overrun by armies of AIDS orphans. But whether the specter of such a future is enough to

convince heads of state that the time is ripe for change remains to be seen.

"My own feeling is, it will take a major shock to the international system to get countries thinking about what's good for the United Nations rather than what's good for their own narrow interests," says the International Peace Academy's Malone, "and that applies to virtually all member states."

By Traci Hukill

Traci Hukill is assistant managing editor of **U.N.** Wire. She can be reached at thukill@nationaljournal.com.

Copyright of **National Journal** is the property of National Journal Group, Inc. and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual use.

Source: National Journal, 11/1/2003, Vol. 35 Issue 44, p3360, 2p

Item: 11406533

Student Template #5

Readings on the Republic of China

Taiwan's Exclusion From **UN**: Unjust and Perilous Treatment

For the 12th consecutive year, Taiwan will soon apply for membership in the United Nations. If matters follow the usual course, the application will be rejected without serious consideration.

But Taiwan's attempt to achieve standing in the international community isn't just a matter of basic fairness for its 23 million people. The island's continuing isolation is the greatest threat to peace and stability in East Asia.

The committee that determines the agenda for the **UN** General Assembly will meet on September 15. Taiwan's allies will press to include an item for its readmission to the world body. The People's Republic of China will do its Incredible-Hulk-on-a-bad-hair-day routine, and the chairman will declare that, there being no consensus, Taiwan's membership bid will be ignored for yet another year.

Ironically, the Republic of China on Taiwan was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945, and an original member of the **UN** Security Council. In 1971, Taipei was expelled from the bastion of international harmony--its membership and Security Council seat bestowed on the PRC.

For the past 33 years, it's as if Taiwan didn't exist, as far as the United Nations is concerned. Most countries take their cue from the **UN**. While almost all trade with the ROC (Taiwan imports more American products than does China--with its 1.3 billion people) only a handful recognize the Taipei government.

On the surface, Taiwan's exclusion from the world organization makes no sense. It's more populous than 60% of **UN** members, and has the world's 18th largest economy.

Postage-stamp sized states (and those whose foreign exchange is derived primarily from the sale of commemorative stamps) are members in good standing. Taiwan--a major player in the world economy as well as a model of democratic development--is treated as a nonentity.

That's because China's communist rulers (who've never ruled the island for a single day) claim to speak for the Taiwanese--which is skin to Mexico City designating California, Texas and the Southwest "rebel provinces" which must submit or face annihilation.

Still, China has the clout to get the most of the international community to go along with a manifest absurdity.

The mainland is obsessed with Taiwan. For at least a decade, Beijing has issued periodic threats to take the island by force, if its people don't agree to being absorbed a la Hong Kong. During Taiwan's 1996 presidential election, the PRC fired missiles toward the island, an act of aggression it repeated in 1999.

China's saber-rattling rises to a crescendo at any hint of a declaration of independence by

Taipei. "We totally have the determination and the ability to crush any attempt to separate Taiwan from China," announced Communist Party Chief Hu Jintao in late August.

In July, the People's Liberation Army conducted war games that simulated an invasion of Taiwan. More than 18,000 troops were involved in the exercise. Beijing currently has 500 medium-range missiles targeting Taiwan, a number expected to rise to 800 by the end of 2005.

Things have gotten so out-of-hand that just weeks ago, Washington sent Admiral Thomas Fargo (commander of US military forces in Asia and the Pacific) to Beijing with a warning: Despite our deployments in the Middle East and Afghanistan, America has both the means and the determination to prevent the PRC from using force against Taiwan.

Ending Taiwan's diplomatic isolation is the surest way to prevent another war in Asia. As long as the ROC remains a phantom on the international scene, China will be encouraged in the deluded belief that the fate of Taiwan is an "internal matter," which the PRC can resolve at a time, and in a way, of its choosing.

While most Taiwanese favor a continuation of the status quo over a formal declaration of independence (why state the obvious?), they will never willingly submit to control by the mainland.

China remains mired in a system that's grafted capitalistic elements onto a totalitarian stock. Taiwan is a genuine democracy, with **human** rights, a free press and popular sovereignty. (In March, Taiwan held its third direct election of a president.) Freedom House rates it one of the two freest nations in Asia.

Friends of freedom and democracy must continue to press for Taiwan's membership in the United Nations.

It's more than a matter of equity. For Taiwan's 23-million citizens, it could have a profound impact on their survival as a free people.

By Don Feder

Mr. Feder is the author of *Who's Afraid of the Religious Right?* (Regnery).

Copyright of **Human Events** is the property of Human Events Inc. and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual use.

Source: Human Events, 9/6/2004, Vol. 60 Issue 30, p10, 1p

Item: 14354308

Barring Taiwan From **UN** a Threat To Peace

You know it's autumn when leaves begin to fall, there's a slight chill in the air, colleges open their doors for another academic year--and the General Assembly rejects Taiwan's annual bid for membership in the United Nations.

When the 58th session of the General Assembly convened on September 16, Taiwan's supporters once again petitioned the world body to include in its agenda consideration of "representation of the Republic of China (Taiwan) in the United Nations."

Communist China and its puppets repeated the preposterous claim that Taiwan (a vibrant democracy with a robust economy and a population larger than two-thirds of the **UN's** member-states) is a province of the People's Republic--which, in reality, has never ruled the island, even for a single day.

On September 17, the General Assembly decided not to place Taiwan's request for admission on its agenda. It's important for Taiwan's friends to keep the issue alive and to remind us of the gross injustice of Taiwan's isolation.

With the recent admission of Switzerland and East Timor, Taiwan becomes the only country not represented at the **UN**. Unlike many of the postage-stamp states seated in the General Assembly, by every measure, Taiwan is a significant player in the global economic system.

According to World Bank data, it has the world's 18th-largest economy. The little dynamo is also the 14th-most major trading nation (with exports of US \$130.6 billion last year) and has the third-largest volume of information-technology exports. In its index of economic freedom for 2003, the Heritage Foundation ranks Taiwan 27th among 161 nations surveyed.

Equally impressive, in the course of less than two decades, Taiwan has gone from authoritarianism to a full-fledged democracy. Freedom House rates it one of the freest nations in Asia. In 1992, citizens of the Republic of China on Taiwan participated in the island's first general parliamentary elections. This was followed by the first direct election of an ROC president in 1996. The year 2000 saw the first transfer of administrative power from one political party to another, following the ROC's second presidential election.

Taiwan has a free press. Political protest is alive and well. **Human** rights are scrupulously protected. In other words, Taiwan stands as a shining example of the **UN's** original vision of peace, democracy, **human** rights and prosperity.

The preamble of the United Nation's Charter sets forth the organization's mission to "reaffirm faith in fundamental **human** rights, in dignity and worth of the **human** person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." What about the rights, dignity and national aspirations of Taiwan's 23 million people? Why are they the exception to this grand vision of equality and justice?

The charter declares that membership in the world body "is open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations of the charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are willing and able to carry out these obligations." Taiwan is peaceable in the extreme. It's

difficult to imagine a nation more anxious to avoid conflict. The ROC is eager to accept international obligations. Without formal ties to most nations, the island still does its part to promote Third World development. In 32 countries, long-term technical missions share Taiwan's expertise in the fields of agriculture, horticulture, fisheries, transport, mining, electrical production and medicine.

The only obstacle to Taiwan's membership in the United Nations lies across the Taiwan Strait. Beijing covets the island. It wants Taiwan's economy. It needs Taiwan's strategic position to fulfill its dream of Asian hegemony.

Through a combination of bribery and intimidation, it has managed to get the overwhelming majority of **UN** member states to agree to the One China fiction--that there is only one China (ruled by a regime which imposes its will on the nation's 1.3 billion inhabitants). Moreover, according to this myth, the Marxist mandarins are the sole legitimate authority in Taiwan as well as on the mainland.

The proposition is so delusional that it could be concocted only by a totalitarian regime. The Communist Party, which has held power on the mainland for over a half-century, has never extended its rule to Taiwan. Over the past 100 years, ties between Taiwan and the Middle Kingdom were practically non-existent. The island was ruled by Japan from 1895 to 1945. From the end of China's civil war (1949) to the present, the Republic of China has been entirely independent of the mainland.

Beijing's insistence that it is the legitimate ruler of Taiwan makes as much sense as the United States' claiming sovereignty over Canada, based on the fact that once we both were part of the British Empire.

The Chinese and Taiwanese share a cultural heritage and ethnic lineage. That's where the similarities stop. Taiwanese and Mandarin are different languages. Taiwan is a democracy that respects **human** rights; China is a totalitarian state that crushes dissent. Taiwan has a free economy; China has elements of capitalism and private property grafted onto a collectivist system. Taiwan is forward-looking and peace-loving; China is militaristic and nurses a wounded national pride for affronts that go back to the 19th Century. Taiwan's leaders are chosen in democratic elections and answerable to the people. Though it may be called The People's Republic, the people of China have nothing to do with the way they are governed.

Yet for all Taiwan's manifest virtues and economic/political progress, it is the invisible man of international affairs.

On May 19, 2003, the ROC lost its seventh bid for membership in the World Health Organization (WHO), even as SARS ravaged the island. (Per capita, Taiwan had the highest SARS death toll in the world.) Due to Taiwan's isolation, it took WHO seven weeks to respond to the island's request for help.

Once again, China orchestrated the rejection of Taiwan--this time for membership in a body whose stated goal is "the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health"--all peoples, that is, except the 23 million people of Taiwan. Ironically, SARS originated in China--which covered up the plague for several crucial months. Then, its policies denied Taiwan speedy assistance in dealing with the disease China had spawned.

In all of this, Beijing's strategy is painfully clear--to deny Taiwan any standing in the

international community. During the 1990s, it routinely stated its intent to absorb the island, by military force if necessary.

By maintaining Taiwan's status as an international outcast, it hopes eventually to persuade or pressure the Taiwanese to accede to incorporation in the mainland.

Then there's the military option, which China's rulers refuse to renounce. If only a handful of states have diplomatic ties with Taiwan, and even the United Nations, which recognizes the nationhood of Andorra (population, 54,500) considers it a nonentity, who will be encouraged to come to the island's support in a crisis provoked by its colossal neighbor?

Thus, Taiwan's exclusion from the United Nations is more than an affront to justice. It's also a threat to peace and stability in East Asia.

By Don Feder

Mr. Feder is the author of *Who's Afraid of the Religious Right?* (Regnery) and *A Jewish Conservative Looks at Pagan America*. He was a syndicated columnist for the Boston Herald from 1983-2002 and is currently a talk show host on WROL, 950 AM in Boston.

Copyright of **Human Events** is the property of Human Events Inc. and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual use.

Source: Human Events, 9/22/2003, Vol. 59 Issue 32, p20, 1p

Item: 10932186

Teacher Template # 1

Student Note Card

On the lined back of a 5" x 8" note-card, each student should number the lines as listed below. In the first 1/3 column, write the statistic or fact to be given, i.e. Official Name. In the second 1/3 column, the teacher should relate the information concerning the United States as a model. Information for lines # 1-11 can be obtained from The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2004 pages 755-854. Note: Use the most current almanac available. Lines #12-18 can be found on the website www.un.org. The relating of the U.S. statistics leads to many student questions, resulting in relevant discussion and interaction.

The students are directed to obtain the information on their assigned state/country and write that information in the final 1/3 column of the note-card. Any variation from this procedure will result in confusion while conducting the comparison exercise. If a room set of Almanacs is unavailable, the teacher can photocopy the information to distribute to the students.

When the backside of the card is completed, the students then decorate the front of the card using the following criteria: The name of the state displayed predominately so it can be read across the room and a creative display representing that state, usually a flag or tourist, cultural, historical attraction. Some students use clipart/photographs/ lettering from the computer, but others draw, use stylized lettering to gain an ownership of their card.

The teacher makes the card of the United States to model the assignment.

Below is a sample card:

1. Official Name (above red line)	United States of America	P.R. of China
2. Population (rounded)	294 million	1.3 billion
3. Population Density/% Urban	83 per square mile/75%	362 per square mile/37%
4. Chief religions (%)	Protestant 56%/Catholic 28%/Jewish 2%	Officially atheist, Buddhism,
5. Area (rounded)	3, 718, 000 square miles	3, 705,000 square mil
6. Government	Federal republic	Communist Party-led
7. Defense Budget/Active troops (rounded)	\$350.7 billion/1.4 million	\$20 billion/2.3 million
8. GDP (rounded)/Per capita GDP	\$10.4 trillion/\$ 37, 600 per person	\$5.7 trillion/\$4,400
9. Life Expectancy/male & female	74.4 male/80.1 female	70.3 male/74.3 female
10. Infant Mortality	6.8 deaths per 1,000 live births	25.3 per 1,000
11. Literacy %	97%	86%
12. U.N. dues contribution/%	\$283.1 million/22%	/ . 97%
13. # of U.N. troops	5 of 46,706 (monthly summary)	790
14. # of U.N. civilian police	536 of 4,764	34
15. # of U.N. military observers	21 of 1,949	53
16. Date entered the U.N.	Oct. 24, 1945 (charter member)	Oct. 24, 1945 (197
17. Name of Lead Delegate	John Danforth	Wang Guangya
18. Security Council membership/veto	Permanent/yes	Permanent/yes

Teacher Template # 2

Suggested Reforms of Security Council

1. **The Razali Plan** envisions increasing the Security Council membership from 15 to 24 by adding five permanent members (one each from the developing states of Africa, Asia, and Latin America & the Caribbean, with two from industrialized states-generally recognized as Japan and Germany), and four non-permanent members (one each from Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America & the Caribbean. The five new permanent members would not have the right to veto, a right that supporters of this plan hope would eventually become obsolete for all Security Council members.
2. The **United States Plan** would increase the permanent members of the Security Council to 10 and the overall membership to 20. This plan would add as permanent members Japan Germany along with three other developing countries, but without the veto power. Speculate on the three others who might be added. Proponents of this plan believe that a larger Council would be unwieldy and less efficient.
3. The U.N. expert, Jeff **Laurenti**, suggests a more creative solution that reassesses global power every 10 years and restructures the Council accordingly.
4. Another suggestion is that the **veto power requires two permanent members states** to vote no in order for the veto to take effect.
5. Other student ideas



Teacher Template # 3

Essay/Response

Type a 2-page paper describing the membership, structure, and power of the present Security Council of the United Nations. Incorporate and explain suggestions for reform that you support. Your reactions to the following quotations should be included:

“The exercise of the veto by the permanent members of the Security Council should be regulated so as to prohibit that power being used at the sole discretion of its holder. It is unjust that any one single country should be allowed the impunity of overruling at will the wish of the majority.” This statement by Malaysia’s Prime Minister Abdullah Ahmad Badawi argues that the modern world should not be dominated by a few wealthy countries chosen more than 50 years ago and should be rendered more democratic and representative of the number and geographic spread of the United Nations membership.

“We will never tolerate Taiwan independence, nor will we allow anyone to separate Taiwan from the rest of China in whatever way.” Said China’s Foreign Minister Li Xiaoxing. He urged the international community to refrain from any action that might promote Taiwan’s bid for independence and to refrain from recognizing “the serious threat posed by the separatist activities of the Taiwan authorities”.

